

2/2/71

Dear Paul,

Relet 29: thanks for enclosures. Jim L has also heard and is writing Brown.

Lowery: I can't find your questions and I've forgotten them. I've filed this extra set of clips and when you remind me what you wanted to know I'll write Paul R and ask, sending the clips.

You are due an explanation. I've been growing steadily wearier in recent years, if I can date it from that enormous emotional and physical drain in W.O. at the end of a long and tiring trip 10-11/68, followed by the greater drain 12/68, followed by what in retrospect is still an inconceivable amount of work re-trial, plus doing PM III and preparing for the Hellock trial. Since then, I suppose in part because I still push myself, in part the conditions of our life, and in part the futilities of trying to defend us gain what I regard as dangers from well-meaning, the evil, the sick and the paranoid, this weariness has become almost oppressive, to the point of physical weakness that is entirely new to me. I've had a few physical and/or emotional problems, what used to be called "nerves", and a few that are unidentified, one of which is current. I lost my sense of balance and was hit with two attacks of dizziness yesterday. It lingers a little. While I have been able to work without interruption on that noon which I was engaged, turning out not less than 4,000 words yesterday while also doing a few other things, about what was not then in my mind I'm fuzzy. So, I recall your writing and sending these clips and my suggestion that I ask Paul R, but what I did with your letter and the original clips I haven't the foggiest notion. I've taken time to look and can't find. Sorry.

Thanks for reassurance on numbers and T, about whom I feel as I always have. I'm checking other sources. I think the combination- that is, letter-numbers ident., is not serious, the six digit one is. There remains the possibility both are, but my hunch is that the combination is as originally reported.

Thanks for M.S.'s address. I think if he could find time it would be very good if he looked up Pat Doyle and asked him for the film Doyle promised me, making two copies there and, if Doyle will lend me the original, I now have better than WC facilities for having a better copy made and work done with it. We'd guarantee to preserve safely. In about six weeks I'll be seeing my contact, from out of town, who does this work. Doyle may remember promising to have copies made and sent to me, but he never did. Also, if you ask him to see him, ask him also what good stills, if any, he'd like made and I'll have them made for him, for I'll be doing this for us anyway. He might like to have some, as might his son and the Wilsons. Be glad to do it, and my boys does this very well, as I've told you (but don't promise him 14" blowups!)

Government's motion for more time re Nichols doesn't interest. I have the rest. What does interest, in any suit, is their legal and argumentative responses. I can and have nailed them in inconsistent citations and uses of the same sources and laws.

I've gotten around that CBS problem. But this suit answer I'm filing is going to be very long for a number of reasons. I'll lend you a clear copy when it is done, if you'd like, and I can lend you their motions (those rotten bastards haven't yet sent me the exhibits attached to it).

Your Mex explanation may be correct, but that would also tend to make them continue to withhold. They could always have covered this by pretend it was Mex cops who did. I feel there may be some meaningful clues in the Mex matter. I had located a dependable person there, by mail, and as soon as I did, although he is a respectable man of some standing (college prof), the cops put him away. The FBI has official agents at every embassy. They used to be called "legal Attaches).

Jim L. is too overloaded to undertake anything extra, but I'll ask him re Jim S's notes. Sned. It will be better to hand him and ask than to just ask and have him say no time.

I had done only a rough inventory of the first list, enough to be able to detect removals, sole objective. But he had added a very few slight notes.

I'd welcome Jim S's notes, with any restrictions written on them, because we cannot longer trust my memory on such things. He was doing fine things and was, in some ways, very sharp. Sorry he is physically separate from you and held to himself so much because much of what he has done is unknown to me.

I do not share your opinion of Mitchell's letter to Brown. I have been pushing them so hard they are being forced to work out positions. I think if you compare what he says with what you know of the guidelines, etc, and the exemptions, whether or not he is on solid ground, it will look like it to the court, and there is no lawyer who will or who can afford to out in the time I do analyzing and getting answers to the legal horseshit they dish out. I must have a small book already done in response to the last to me, and they have not yet ended their dirty tricks.

What you terms your "sudden paranoid thought" may be that, but I am more inclined to consider it a sharp observation and, as of now, the greater likelihood of all the possibilities I've considered. A curt bow and a swirling cape to you! I'm ashamed of not thinking of it myself. These are not brilliant people, but they are competent, unscrupulous and have spent their lives developing and perfecting dirty tricks. They have come to regard such things as right and proper, which is even worse.

Sincerely,